



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,213	12/12/2001	David Edwin Thurston	065435-9010	1106

23510 7590 05/20/2003

MICHAEL REST & FRIEDRICH, LLP
ONE SOUTH RINCKNEY STREET
P O BOX 1806
MADISON, WI 53701

EXAMINER

COLEMAN, BRENDA LIBBY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1624

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/021,213

Applicant(s)

THURSTON et al.

Examiner

Brenda Coleman

Art Unit

1624



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/763,767.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 1 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1624

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-9 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is as a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain as a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 2-5 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

HOW TO USE: In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

The nature of the invention in the instant case, has claims which embrace substituted pyrrolo[2,1-c][1,4]benzodiazepin-5-one dimer compounds. Claims 2-5 and 7-9 are to a method of treating a gene-based disease, method of treating a viral, parasitic or bacterial infection, method of treating a cisplatin-refractory disease, and a method of inhibiting the growth of cisplatin-

Art Unit: 1624

refractory cells, respectively, comprising the step of administering a compound of claims 1 and/or 6. Any evidence presented must be commensurate in scope with the claims and must clearly demonstrate the effectiveness of the claimed compounds. However, the specification provides no definitive evidence to correlate any one disorder selected from those disclosed in the specification with the instantly disclosed pyrrolo[2,1-c][1,4]benzodiazepin-5-one dimer compounds.

Testing is provided for only a few of the claimed compounds spanning pages 201-214. Examples should be of sufficient scope as to justify the scope of the claims. However, the generic claims are much broader in scope than is represented by the testing. Markush claims must be provided with support in the disclosure. Markush claims are subject to rejection based upon the lack of supporting disclosure when the “working examples” fail to include written description(s) which teach how to make and use Markush members embraced thereby in full, clear, and exact terms. See *In re Fouche* 169 USPQ 429. The compounds tested are not seen adequately representative of the compounds encompassed by the extensive Markush groups instantly claimed for the uses instantly asserted and claimed.

The specification fails to disclose working examples on the use of the pyrrolo[2,1-c][1,4]benzodiazepin-5-one dimer compounds. The absence of working examples is one of the factors to be considered in deciding whether the practice of an invention would involve undue experimentation. There must be evidence to justify the contention that the claimed compounds can be useful in the treatment of lung, colon, CNS, melanoma, renal and breast cell lines.

Art Unit: 1624

In general, pharmacological activity is a very unpredictable area. In cases involving physiological activity "the scope of the enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved." *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970). Since this case involves unpredictable *in-vivo* physiological activities, the scope of the enablement given in the disclosure presented here was found to be low.

2. Claims 2-5 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The scope of the method claims are not adequately enabled solely based on the regulation of gene expression or its inhibitory effect on cisplatin-refractory cells provided in the specification. The specification, while being enabling for bacterial infections, does not reasonably provide enablement for treatment of all disorders claimed herein. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. In addition to other disorders which are difficult to treat these claims call for the treatment of cancer which are capable of being modulated by regulation of gene expression and/or inhibiting the growth of cisplatin-refractory cells. However, there never has been a compound capable of treating cancer generally. There are compounds that treat a range of cancers, but no one has ever been able to figure out how to get a compound to treat cancer generally, or even a majority of cancers. Thus, the existence of such a

Art Unit: 1624

“silver bullet” is contrary to our present understanding in oncology. Even the most broadly effective antitumor agents are only effective against a small fraction of the vast number of different cancers known. This is true in part because cancers arise from a wide variety of sources, such as viruses (e.g. EBV, HHV-8, and HTLV-1), exposure to chemicals such as tobacco tars, genetic disorders, ionizing radiation, and a wide variety of failures of the body’s cell growth regulatory mechanisms. Different types of cancers affect different organs and have different methods of growth and harm to the body, and different vulnerabilities. Thus, it is beyond the skill of oncologists today to get an agent to be effective against cancers generally, evidence that the level of skill in this art is low relative to the difficulty of such a task.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 2-5 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following reasons apply:

- a) Claims 2 and 7 are vague and indefinite in that the claim provides for the use of claimed compounds, but the claim does not set forth any steps involved in determining which are the diseases capable of being mediated by regulation of gene expression. It is unclear which diseases are mediated by regulation of gene expression. Determining whether a given disease responds or does not respond to

Art Unit: 1624

such an inhibitor will involve undue experimentation. Suppose that a given drug, which has inhibitor properties *in vitro*, when administered to a patient with a certain disease, does not produce a favorable response. One can not conclude that specific disease does not fall within this claim. Keep in mind that:

a. It may be that the next patient will respond. No pharmaceutical has 100% efficacy. What success rate is required to conclude our drug is a treatment? Thus, how many patients need to be treated? If "successful treatment" is what is intended, what criterion is to be used? If one person in 10 responds to a given drug, does that mean that the disease is treatable? One in 100? 1,000? 10,000? Will the standard vary depending on the current therapy for the disease?

B. It may be that the wrong dosage or dosage regimen was employed. Drugs with similar chemical structures can have markedly different pharmacokinetics and metabolic fates. It is quite common for pharmaceuticals to work and or be safe at one dosage, but not at another that is significantly higher or lower. Furthermore, the dosage regimen may be vital --- should the drug be given e.g. once a day, or four times in divided dosages? The optimum route of administration can not be predicted in advance. Should our drug be given as a bolus *iv* or in a time release *po* formulation. Thus, how many dosages and dosage regimens must be tried before one is certain that our drug is not a treatment for this specific disease?

Art Unit: 1624

C. It may be that our specific drug, while active *in vitro*, simply is not potent enough or produces such low concentrations in the blood that it is not an effective treatment of the specific disease. Perhaps a structurally related drug is potent enough or produces high enough blood concentrations to treat the disease in question, so that the first drug really does fall within the claim. Thus, how many different structurally related inhibitors must be tried before one concludes that a specific compound does not fall within the claim?

D. Conversely, if the disease responds to our second drug but not to the first, both of whom are inhibitors *in vitro*, can one really conclude that the disease falls within the claim? It may be that the first compound result is giving the accurate answer, and that the success of second compound arises from some other unknown property which the second drug is capable. It is common for a drug, particularly in the field of antibiotics, to work by many mechanisms. The history of psychopharmacology is filled with drugs, which were claimed to be a pure receptor *XXY* agonist or antagonist, but upon further experimentation shown to effect a variety of biological targets. In fact, the development of a drug for a specific disease and the determination of its biological site of action usually precede linking that site of action with the disease. Thus, when mixed results are obtained, how many more drugs need be tested?

Art Unit: 1624

E. Suppose that our drug is an effective treatment of the disease of interest, but only when combined with some totally different drug. There are for example, agents in antiviral and anticancer chemotherapy which are not themselves effective, but are effective treatments when the agents are combined with something else.

Consequently, determining the true scope of the claim will involve extensive and potentially inconclusive research. Without it, one skilled in the art cannot determine the actual scope of the claim. Hence, the claim is indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

a person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Gregson et al., Chem. Commun. Gregson teaches the compounds, compositions and method of use of the compounds of formula II where R_6 is hydrogen, R_7 is methoxy, R_8 forms the dimer through the bridge $-O-(CH_2)_3-O-$, R_9 is hydrogen, and R'_2 is CH_2 . See example 1.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brenda Coleman whose telephone number is (703) 305-1880. The examiner

Art Unit: 1624

can normally be reached on Mondays from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM, on Tuesdays from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM, on Wednesday thru Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-4734 for "unofficial" purposes and the actual number for **OFFICIAL** business is **308-4556**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.



Brenda Coleman
Primary Examiner AU 1624
May 18, 2003